UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,571	08/02/2006	Estelle Transy	18394017US1RVLPA61423US	2383

26221   7590   05/13/2009
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
WRIGHT, BRYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/13/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Advisory Action **Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**	Application No. 10/565,571	Applicant(s) TRANSY ET AL.
	Examiner BRYAN WRIGHT	Art Unit 2431

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *21-31*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
    See Note Below:.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/BRYAN WRIGHT/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

Note: Applicant recites [par. 62], "and extracts the identification and authentication parameters therefrom. These parameters are transmitted in steps 28, 29 in authentication messages 46, 47, respectively, to the authentication servers 16 of the selected access provider and service provider. The identification information ID1 and ID2 is, for example, in the form "IdA@domainA," wherein "IdA" enables the user to be uniquely identified to the access or service provider, and "domainA" makes it possible to determine the domain name, in the IP network, of the server to which the corresponding authentication message is to be sent"

Examiner contends applicant's argument of deficiency on the part of Rezaiifar as part of applicant remarks 5/7/2009 recites, "Further, Rezaiifar does not describe an access controller which transmits to each of the two entities, a respective authentication request containing the identification data and the authentication data to the respective entity of the network contained in the access request". The identification as described by applicant in [par. 62] is in the form of ", in the form "IdA@domainA," wherein "IdA" enables the user to be uniquely identified to the access or service provider, and "domainA" makes it possible to determine the domain name, in the IP network, of the server to which the corresponding authentication message is to be sent".

Examiner contends Rezaiifer teaches, [0039] "When the AT 112(2) desires to utilize an additional service, e.g., a position location service, the AT 112(2) generates a dynamic name server (DNS) 122(2) query 206 for a local service by supplying a non-fully qualified name for the local service (e.g., local_ServiceSelector) to the BSC/PCF 108(3). The term non-fully qualified name is used herein to mean a name that does not include the domain name. For example, a name "LocalServer.company.com" is a fully qualified name, but a name "LocalServer" is a non-qualified name. The BSC/PCF 108(3) receives the query 206 and generates a query 208 to the DNS 122(2). The DNS 122(2) responds by providing an Internet protocol address of the requested SS 118(2) (IP_ServiceSelector) to the BSC/PCF 108(3), which forwards the response to the AT 112(2). ....[0040] Once the AT 112(2) receives the IP_ServiceSelector of the SS 118(2), the AT 112(2) can request the service by generates and sends a service query 210 addressed to the SS 118(2). The service query is a structure comprising a source address, i.e., the AT 112(2) IP_AT.sub.1, the destination address, i.e., the IP_ServiceSelector of SS 118(2), and capabilities of the AT 112(2) necessary for determining which service to is to be provided. Such capabilities comprise, e.g., grade of service, radio configuration/technology, and other capabilities known to one of ordinary skills in the art".

Examiner contends one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize Rezaiifar's teachings of "LocalServer" would be equivalent to applicant's "IDA". Furthermore, as indicated by Rezaiffier this information is sent for authentication [par. 41]. Also, one of ordinary skilled in the art would recognize that Rezaiffar's teaching of "SS" is equivalent to applicant's "Access Server" and Rezaiifer's teachings of "BSC/PCF and DNS" would be equivalent to applicant's teaching of "two entities".

With regards to applicant's remarks concerning claim 21, Examiner respectfully submits claim 21 stands rejected under Stenberg in view of Rezaiifer and that applicant is responsible for both reference in combination and as a whole. Therefore, Examiner respectfully submits Rezaiifer teaches applicant's claim elements of "authenticating the user to the two entities of the network", "wherein the inserted data for authenticating the user comprises a distinct set of data for each of the two entities" and "access controller transmits, to each of the two entities" respectively.

First, the Examiner contends the claim limitation element of "authenticating the user to the two entities of the network" can be found in Rezaiifer, figure 2. Secondly, the Examiner contends the claim limitation element of "wherein the inserted data for authenticating the user comprises a distinct set of data for each of the two entities" can be found in Rezaiifer [par. 40], for which recites sending AT_IP and capabilities of the AT. Third, the Examiner contends the claim limitation element of "access controller transmits, to each of the two entities" can be found in fig. 2.